F
851
.B222

Author

Title

Imprint

16—47372-3 GPO

PROCEEDINGS

OF

The Society of California Pioneers

In Reference to the Histories

OF

HUBERT HOWE BANCROFT

1042
C

SAN FRANCISCO:

STERETT PRINTING COMPANY

FEBRUARY, 1894

MISREPRESENTATIONS

OF

EARLY CALIFORNIA HISTORY

CORRECTED

Proceedings of The Society of California Pioneers in regard to certain misrepresentations of men and events in early California history made in the works of

HUBERT HOWE BANCROFT

AND COMMONLY KNOWN AS

BANCROFT'S HISTORIES

HALL OF

THE SOCIETY OF CALIFORNIA PIONEERS

SAN FRANCISCO

FEBRUARY, 1894

F851
.B222

INTRODUCTION.

The Society of California Pioneers is composed of men who came to California prior to the first day of January, 1850, and their male descendants.

The proceedings hereinafter recited have been taken therefore, after due and careful deliberation, by men, who are personally familiar with the true facts of early California history, and who have been actuated by a sense of duty to themselves and to posterity in correcting certain gross misrepresentations in regard to the men and events of that early period.

These misrepresentations have appeared from time to time in the books commonly known as "Bancroft's Histories," and have heretofore passed unchallenged and found common public acceptance as authority for reviewers, and others who have written upon the subject.

The time has at last arrived when, in the judgment of the now old men who yet compose the majority of members of this Society, the gross mis-statements in regard to men and events which these books contain should be refuted, by the publication of the testimony of living witnesses, so that that testimony may go upon record and be perpetuated, and the real facts and truth of history be vindicated.

In all its proceedings upon this question this Society has vainly sought to find a just motive on the part of the so-called "Historian" Bancroft for the astonishing mis-statements which he has given in his works. No excuse, no circumstance of palliation has so far been offered by him in the matter.

This Society can do no more, therefore, than to refer the whole subject to the deliberative judgment of a discriminating public, in the belief that the common verdict of that public as well as that of posterity will be that such so-called "history" as that herein considered will forever be held to be unworthy of credence, and will deserve and find no place in the public or private libraries of the world.

HALL OF

The Society of California Pioneers

SAN FRANCISCO, NOVEMBER 1893.

In the matter of the Society of California Pioneers,

vs.

Hubert Howe Bancroft, an Honorary Member of said Society.

On the second day of October, 1893, at a regular monthly meeting of the Society of California Pioneers, a resolution was introduced by Dr. Washington Ayer, of which the following is a copy, viz.:

"Whereas, statements have been made by an honorary member of this Society in a quasi-history published by one Hubert Howe Bancroft, which are at variance with historical records, and reflect upon the honor, dignity and integrity of the California Pioneers, and

"Whereas, All such statements have no foundation of truth, and are unworthy the labors of an upright historian, and only becoming to one, who in our judgment strayed far from the

domain of an honest writer, with the purpose in view to mislead the reader and wrong the founders of a new State upon the extreme western boundary of our country, and by such statements did wantonly and maliciously wrong the old Argonauts; therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the name of Hubert Howe Bancroft be stricken from the list of Honorary Members of this Society, and that the Secretary be requested to send him a copy of this preamble and resolution."

After some debate the foregoing resolution was adopted and Dr. Wm. S. Simpson gave notice that at the next regular monthly meeting of the Society he would move for a reconsideration of the vote upon the adoption of such resolution.

At the regular monthly meeting of the Society, held on the 6th day of November, 1893, Dr. Simpson, in accordance with the notice so given, moved that the vote upon the before recited resolution be reconsidered, which motion, after debate, was adopted.

The resolution was then referred to a special committee consisting of Dr. Wm. S. Simpson, A. S. Hall, R. Thompson and S. W. Holladay, with instructions to notify Mr. Bancroft of the action that has been taken by the Society, and to request him to appear before such committee—if he desired to do so—and show cause why his name should not be struck from the roll of Honorary Membership, as proposed in the resolution under consideration.

Herewith are presented the specific charges against Hubert Howe Bancroft, alluded to in the before recited resolution, and which constitute the reasons why it is sought to strike the name of said Bancroft from the roll of Honorary Membership of said Society.

First.—Because of the facts stated in the following preamble and resolutions, introduced at the regular monthly meeting of the Society of California Pioneers, on the 7th day of August, 1893, by W. B. Farwell and unanimously adopted at the next regular monthly meeting of the Society, held on the 4th day of September, 1893.

"WHEREAS, In the organization and founding of the Society of California Pioneers, one of its declared and most important purposes was set forth in its constitution as follows, viz.: 'To collect and preserve information connected with the early settlement and subsequent history of the country, and also, in all appropriate matters to advance the interests and perpetuate the memory of those whose sagacity, energy and enterprise induced them to settle in the wilderness and become the founders of a new State,' and

"WHEREAS, In pursuance of these declared purposes, we, who are yet living witnesses of the more prominent events of early California history, and who were contemporaries of the men whose names are most prominent as actors and participants in these events, deem it our duty not only to 'collect and preserve information in regard to the acqusition and settlement of California,' but also to correct misstatements and misrepresentations of so-called historians who have written upon the subject, whenever and wherever they may be found, and

"WHEREAS, Hubert Howe Bancroft, in his so-called 'History of California,' has, within the personal knowledge and recollection of many of the old Pioneers here present, distorted the facts and truths of such history, and maligned the memory of many of the men most conspicuous as participants in these early events, more of which misrepresentations as illustrative of the purposes of these resolutions are summarized as follows, viz:

"First. Fremont is designated a 'filibuster,' whose almost every act in California was a wrong from beginning to end. He says (See Vol. 3 of his 'History of California,' pages 747 and 749): 'When the authorities very properly ordered him to leave California, he fortified a position on Gavilan Peak and raised the U. S. flag. This was foolish bravado, as he realized after a day or two of reflection in connection with Consul Larkin's advice and the sight of military preparations at San Juan, so he ran away in the night.'

"And again, speaking of the Bear Flag revolt, he says, 'That most indefensible rising of the settlers which interrupted negotiations for a pacific change of flag, would not have occurred but for Fremont's promise of active support when needed; therefore, he must be held responsible not only for the bloodshed and bitterness of feeling that attended the conflict of 1846-7, but for the much more disastrous state of affairs which but for sheer good luck must have resulted.'

"And again: 'At Monterey though Commodore Sloat would not adopt his views, Fremont found in Stockton a filibuster after his own heart, willing to incorporate the Gavilan episode and the Bear Flag revolt in the sacred cause of the United States.'

"And again, speaking of the controversy which subsequently arose between Stockton and Kearney, in which Fremont was loyal to Stockton as he was in duty bound to be, Bancroft sneeringly remarks: 'Though technically disobeying military orders, Fremont could not with the honor that should prevail among filibusters as well as thieves, abandon his chief,' etc. And he closes his biographical sketch in these words: 'Fremont did more than any other to prevent or retard the conquest of California. He is to be regarded as an adventurer of marvelous good fortune, for a man of moderate abilities to be made conspicuous before the world or to enjoy opportunities that cannot be utilized.'

"These are but a few of the many false and malicious statements made by Bancroft in regard to Fremont, and which we have thus specifically quoted with proper reference to the volume and pages where they may be found. Through his history Fremont is constantly misrepresented, and the part that he played in the acquisition of California is constantly belittled and distorted to suit a seemingly vengeful malice existing in the mind of the historian, the cause of which it is not our purpose or duty to inquire into.

"Second. Of Commodore Stockton he says (See page 735, Vol. 5 of his 'History of California,'): 'His whole policy of conquest which was to produce such unhappy results, his blustering tirade against imaginary evils, his willingness to identify a criminal revolt of vagabond settlers,' (referring to the men of the Bear Flag party, with a legitimate military occupation, etc.,) 'his whole reputation as conqueror of California, is as unmerited as that of the Pathfinder.'

"Third. 'The acts of the Bear Flag party,' as above referred to, in which during its operations, such men as John Bidwell, Samuel J. Henley, Pearson B. Redding, Robert Semple, and other equally well-known early Californians were participants, 'were,' says he, 'a criminal revolt of vagabond settlers.'" And he designates the man who was placed first in command of the Bear Flag party, Ezekiel Merritt, whom Fremont says was 'a rugged man, fearless and simple, taking delight in incurring risks, but tractable, and not given to asking questions when there was something he was required to do,' as a 'coarse-grained, loud-mouthed, whisky-drinking, quarrelsome fellow, well adapted to the use that was made of him in promoting the filibuster schemes.' (See page 736 of Vol. 4 of Bancroft's History of California.)

"Fourth. More criminally wicked and more cruel than all, is his denunciation of that gentle and generous-hearted man,

the late General John A. Sutter, (see Vol. 5, pages 738 to 740, for what follows), and after stating that he had obtained from him personally at his home in Latiz, Penn., 'the story of his wrongs,' and which was without doubt truthfully told, he turns upon him with wolf-like ferocity and reads him thus: 'He was a German-Swiss trader, compelled by bankruptcy to become an adventurer in America. None of the pioneers have received so much praise from so many sources, few have deserved so little. He was but an adventurer from the first. entitled to no admiration or sympathy. His career in New Mexico was at the best discreditable. He came to California in the false character of a captain in the French Army. Of principle or honor, of respect for the rights of others, we find but slight trace in him. There was no side of any controversy he would not adopt at the call of interest. Nationality, religion, friendship, obligation, consistency counted for little or nothing. There were no classes of his associates, hardly an individual, with whom he did not quarrel or whom in his anger he did not roundly abuse. His only capital was money borrowed on the way to California, or property obtained on credit from Californians and Russians after his arrival, all on pretenses more or less false. He never hesitated to assume any obligation for the future, without regard to his ability to meet it. He rarely if ever paid a debt when due.'

"Sutter's Fort he designates as 'an isolated rendezvous for the hostile and uncontrollable elements of a vagabond population in the far interior'—referring here, of course, mainly to the American settlers in the Sacramento Valley. And again: 'Though Sutter's establishment did something to promote the influx of American settlers, it was in no sense beneficial to the interests of the United States, merely fomenting filibusterism with all its unhappy results.'

"That Sutter treated immigrants 'more kindly than a dozen others,' and that he did so 'at a personal sacrifice,' is not true.

Neither is it true 'that Sutter in 1845–6 was friendly to the United States, or to the immigrants as Americans.' And

"WHEREAS, Without quoting further from this monstrous series of libels upon the memories of departed illustrious Pioneers and monstrous perversion of the facts of history, it is hereby

"*Resolved*, That Bancroft's denunciation of Fremont, Stockton and Sutter. and his designation of the men of the Bear Flag party as vagabond settlers, are plainly the vaporings of a mind distorted by prejudice, or envenomed by malice, and attach a greater degree of disgrace to their author than to the honored names and memories of the men whom he thus maliciously maligns.

"*Resolved*, That upon the principle of 'false in one thing, false in all,' Bancroft's 'History of California,' so-called, is, in the opinion of this Society, unworthy of credence as authority, or as a source of correct information for present or future generations, and merits the just condemnation of every fair-minded man, whose early personal experiences enable him to form a true estimate of its value."

Second.—Because of the malicious misrepresentations of the characters of some of the men who were among the earlier pioneers of California, and who were also among the founders, and respected members of this Society up to the day of their death; as instance the following:

Of Andrew J. Grayson—a man renowned in the scientific world as an ornithologist, whose contributions to that branch of scientific knowledge are commonly acknowledged as hardly inferior in value and interest to those of Audubon. This man, Mr. Bancroft in his "Pioneer Index and Register" (Vol. 3, page 764) alludes to (after saying that "he was active in raising men for the California Batallion, in which he ranked

as lieutenant,") as "a gambler and an associate of Lippincott, McDougal and other like characters," which statement, in so far as it accuses Grayson of being a gambler, is wickedly and cruelly false, and known to be so by many pioneers now living, who were honored by being counted among his personal friends.

Of Benjamin S. Lippincott, alluded to in his remarks upon Grayson, (see Vol. 4, "History of California," page 714,) he says: "He was a gambler by profession and one of the boys;" another equally false and malicious mis-statement, and known to be so by many pioneers still living, who can testify to that fact. Even Bancroft himself, with strange inconsistency, in the same notice of Lippincott, says: "He was active in raising recruits for the war, and served as Lieutenant of Company H., California Batallion, also acting as quarter-master." He says also: "He was owner of town lots, a candidate for the council, a Member of the Constitutional Convention of '49, representing San Joaquin county in the first Legislature, and Calaveras in '55 and '61."

Of George McDougal, also alluded to in his notice of Grayson, he says (See Vol. 4, page 723): "He lived at Santa Cruz and Gilroy; served as a kind of unattached volunteer in the California Batallion in '46 and '47; was a broker, *that is a gambler*, at San Francisco in '47 and '48, becoming the owner of many town lots in partnership with Lippincott," etc.

These men, as has been said, were among the early pioneers of California, and were also among the founders of this Society. Clearly, after the misrepresentations and abuse heaped upon the memories of Fremont, Stockton, Sutter, the men of the Bear Flag party, and all who were active in bringing about the acquisition of California as an American possession, it is not difficult to find the motive for this gross aspersion upon their memories, when we consider that each

one of them was an active participant in that patriotic work which was so distasteful to Mr. Bancroft.

Third.—Because of willful and malignant misrepresentations of various other Americans, who were among the early settlers in California, of the part which they played in the events that preceded, and transpired during the conquest of the country, as instanced in the following statement of facts:

In 1840, a hundred or more American and other foreign residents were arrested by the Mexican authorities, taken to Monterey under the accusation of having plotted against the government. Among them were such men as Dr. Marsh, who lived upon the San Joaquin river; Livermore, from whom Livermore's pass and valley were named, and others of like prominence. They were imprisoned, maltreated, subjected to great hardships and suffering, and some fifty or more were finally expatriated and sent to Mexico, but were subsequently released and sent back by the Mexican authorities, with a money indemnity for the wrong which had been put upon them.

T. J. Farnham, an American, who chanced to be at Monterey while these men were imprisoned there, in his book entitled "Life, Adventures and Travels in California," (published in 1852) gives a thrilling account of the matter, in which he says (see page 59): "Mr. Larkin made arrangements with the government to day to furnish the prisoners with food and drink. Their cells were examined and found destitute of floors. The ground was so wet that the poor fellows sunk into it several inches at every step. On this they stood, sat and slept. From fifty to sixty were crowded into a room eighteen to twenty feet square. They could not all sit at once, even in that vile pool, still less lie down. The cells were so low and tight that the only way of getting air enough to sustain life was to divide themselves into platoons, each of which, in turn, stood at the grate awhile to breathe. Most of them had been in prison seven or eight days, with no food except a trifling

quantity, clandestinely introduced by a few daring countrymen outside. When I arrived at the prison, some of them were frantic, others in a stupor of exhaustion and appeared to be dying.''

Farnham then goes on and gives a detailed narrative of the events which preceded this cruelty, and as afterwards so clearly shown to the Mexican authorities that they disavowed and disapproved it. He gives the names of the prisoners, among whom, in addition to those already named, were those of Nathaniel Spear, Peter Storm, afterwards a prominent Bear Flag man: Mark West and other well known men of that time, and he says (page 70): "Forty-one of the prisoners, whose names appear on the concluding pages of the last chapter, furnished me with written accounts of their arrest and subsequent treatment." Some of which statements he gives in full, and which simply corroborate all that he states concerning the affair.

It is proper to state here, that while all this was done during the time and under the direction of Alvarado, who was then governor, the most brutal treatment of the prisoners and their subsequent deportation to Mexico in chains was carried out by the same Don Jose Castro, who, as we have already seen, ordered Fremont out of the country, and was the leading spirit of every movement against Americans prior to the conquest of California.

Coming now to Mr. Bancroft's treatment of this matter. In Volume 4, of his "History of California," he gives the story of the arrest and deportation from beginning to end, breathing a spirit of hostility to the prisoners and their historian Farnham, and an equally zealous endeavor to apologize for and to explain away the conduct of the Mexican authorities, and Castro in particular.

Admitting that the statements were made by some of the prisoners to Farnham, as given in the latter's book, and quoting some of them himself, Bancroft says (Vol. 4, page 15): "The victims and their friends have accused the Californians, not only of having exiled them without cause, but of cruelty at the time of arrest, during their confinement, and on the voyage to San Blas. These charges are, I believe, exaggerated, though from the nature of the case, they cannot be entirely disproved. *In considering the evidence to be offered, the reader should bear in mind the character of the exiles, as men whose word could not be trusted, the opportunity to make their stories agree, their interest with a view to indemnity from Mexico in maintaining their wrongs and exaggerating them, and the prevailing spirit of every thing Mexican, which in the following years served as a favorable medium for their complaints.*"

A statement backed by not one word of evidence to support it, and considering the wantoness of calling a body of fifty or more men, about *all* of whom he could by no possibility have had adequate knowledge to justify it, as "*men whose word could not be trusted;*" it is sufficient in itself to justify this Society in condemning him as an historian, and as unworthy of association with them.

But following out his line of policy as an historical writer, and to show how he proceeds to establish his propositions by arrogant and unscrupulous dictum, instead of by presentation of historical facts, attention is drawn to his statements about Farnham, who has already been quoted as the chief narrator of this episode in the early history of California. Of him, Bancroft says (Vol. 4, page 25): "His remarks on men and events at Monterey are so evidently and absurdly false as to throw more than a doubt upon all that he says." And again, in his biographical notice of him, (Vol. 3, page 734) he says: "His work on California is criticised elsewhere in this work; here it must suffice to say, that in all those parts resting on

his own observation, it is worthless trash, and in all that relates to the California people, a tissue of falsehood." And yet, nowhere does he attempt to impeach his statements except by this sweeping dictum of his own imperious will, and his apologetic efforts to present the case in the strongest possible pro-Mexican and anti-American spirit.

Illustrative of this latter proposition, it is well to quote here his laudatory praise of Don Jose Castro, who, as has been shown, was always the most active, influential and effective enemy to Americans in California. Of him, he says (Vol. 2, page 752): "With his acts in the contest with the settlers and the United States little fault can be found. He did not maltreat the exiles of '40, as charged by Farnham and others. He did not break his pledge to Fremont in the spring of '46, nor did he do any of the absurd things attributed to him in connection with the Gavilan affair; but his conduct was far more honorable, dignified and consistent than that of Fremont. He did not threaten to drive the immigrants back into the snows of the interior, but treated them with uniform kindness In the southern negotiations of August, he bore a much more honorable part than did Commodore Stockton," and so on *ad nauseam*.

Of this same Castro, Commodore Stockton, in his proclamation on taking command in July, 1846, at Monterey, said: "The present general of the forces of California is a usurper; he has been guilty of great offences; has impoverished and drained the country of almost its last dollar, and has deserted his post now when most needed. He has deluded and deceived the inhabitants of California and they wish his expulsion from the country. He came into power by rebellion and force, and by force he must be expelled."

Whose testimony shall prevail, Bancroft, writing from the standpoint of narrow prejudice forty years after the events

which he is relating, or Stockton, the active, able and patriotic contemporary of the man whom he knew so well, and with whose every official act he was so thoroughly familiar?

One more witness remains to be heard on this arrest and expatriation of Americans in 1840, which the historian Bancroft has so assiduously endeavored to explain away and gloss over.

Thomas O. Larkin, in a communication to the Secretary of State, of June 15, 1846, written before he had received the news of the hoisting of the Bear Flag, and Fremont's active operations in the north, said: "The undersigned improves the opportunity of observing that there cannot be brought forward by the President against Mexico, any claim or demand so strong and so impetuous as the unjust and cruel arrest, imprisonment and shipment in irons of so many Americans from this port in April, 1840. Californians in California committed this most outrageous act, and they and their territory should be held responsible for the deed."

Fourth.—Because of the following facts which speak for themselves. In his "History of Oregon," volume 2, (first edition) page 97, in relating the story of the trial of certain Cayuse Indians for murder before Judge O. C. Pratt, a former member of this Society, now deceased, he says: The solemnity and quiet of religious services characterized the trial, at which between two or three hundred persons were present. At its close, when the jury had returned a verdict of guilty, there was no unseemly approval, only a long drawn sigh of relief that the dreadful business was drawing to a close. Attending the episode were the usual hypocrisies of society. It was predetermined by the people that these Indians should die. For myself, I think they were guilty and ought to have died. But, I would not, on that account, as a narrator of facts, indulge in divers little fictions to make the affair more pathetic. Nor

was it at all necessary for the spectator to pat the judge on the back for being 'so firm and fearless.' There was not the slightest danger that Pratt would go against the people in this matter. *But he ruled as he did, not so much from any just and noble sentiments, as, first, because there was present no inducement for him to do otherwise, the fifty horses not going to the judge, and secondly he well knew the country would be too hot to hold him should he do otherwise.*"

In the *second edition* of the same volume of the "History of Oregon," at the same page, all this is stricken out, and in its place appears the following: "The solemnity of religious services characterized the entire trial, at which between four and five hundred persons were present, who watched the proceedings with intense anxiety. Counsel appointed by the judge made vigorous effort to clear their clients. No one unfamiliar with the condition of affairs in the territory of Oregon at the time of which I am writing, can realize the interest displayed by the people of the entire country in this important and never to be forgotten trial. The bare thought that the five wretches, that had assassinated Dr. Whitman, Mrs. Whitman, Mr. Saunders, and a large number of immigrants, might by any technicality of the law, be allowed to go unpunished, was sufficient to distract every man, woman and child throughout the length and breadth of the territorial limits.

"The judge appreciated in all its seriousness the responsibility of his position. He seemed to realize that upon his decision hung the lives of thousands of the whites inhabiting the Willamette Valley. He proved, however, equal to the emergency. His knowledge of the law was not only thorough, but during his early life, and before having been called to the bench in Oregon, he had become familiar with all the questions involving territorial boundaries and treaty stipulations. His position was dignified, firm and fearless. His charge was full, logical and concise. His judicial action in this and many

other trials of a criminal and civil nature in the territory during his judgeship, made it manifest to the great body of the early settlers that he was not only thoroughly versed in all the needed learning required in his position, but in addition to the unswerving determination that the law should be upheld and enforced, created general confidence and reliance that he would be equal to his position in all emergencies."

Clearly, one or the other of these statements is false. Clearly, Mr. Bancroft must of a necessity be well aware of the fact. Clearly, no true and impartial historian could have written both and published them to the world. Clearly, any one calling himself an historian, who would be guilty of doing so, and who occupies the position of an "Honorary Member" of this Society, should, by reason of this fact alone, separate and apart from any other consideration, be dropped from its roll.

It remains to be added, that since the first edition of this volume was issued, it has been surreptitiously withdrawn from the library of this Society and from other public libraries, and the new edition substituted therefor. But the crime remains unpunished.

Fifth.—Because, in the second volume of his History of Oregon, in a foot note originally prepared and printed for that volume, at page 246, appeared the followlng malignant and cruel attack upon the name of one, whose name and memory any true American reveres: "Among these soldiers was U. S. Grant, a man of mediocre abilities and somewhat loose habits, subsequently elevated by accident to the head of the Army, and twice to the Presidency of the United States. Not satisfied to rest upon the world's highest honors, he turned and took a downward course; asked again to be President, was refused; begged from poor Mexico important concessions and was refused, and finally engaged in a business, which was disreputably managed and resulted in ignominious failure. So the end of the man was as bad as the beginning."

It was only by the earnest intercession of those who had become acquainted with the fact that this monstrous wrong was about to be perpetrated, that Mr. Bancroft was finally induced to have this cruel slander stricken out and a new page printed in its place. For this mean, cowardly and unpatriotic attack also, the name of Hubert Howe Bancroft deserves to be stricken from the roll of Honorary Membership of this Society. But still, in matters of this kind, the utter want of patriotism on the part of this "historian" would in some similar way find expression. And of that other great hero of the Civil War, "Farragut," he would have his fling, and that still remains on record in his works. In Volume 2 of his "Popular Tribunals," at page 417, occurs the following: "Farragut's mind seems to have undergone a change. Evidently, he had made up his mind, as some years later was the case, with regard to fighting for or against his countrymen, that in case of a conflict, right or wrong, he must be found on the side of the strongest, which unquestionably would be that of the Federal authorities."

Sixth.—Because, throughout this never-ending series of books known as "Bancroft's Histories," there runs such a monstrous perversion of facts, such glaring contradictions, such a spirit of prejudice and seemingly malignant dislikes and hatreds of the men of whom he has written, and such a willful distortion of events concerning which they claim to be a faithful record, that it would be a public wrong, if not a public crime for this Society to give countenance to them, by permitting further association with Mr. Bancroft in the relation of "Honorary Membership." In illustration and proof of this assertion, sweeping as it may be, instance the following summary:

In his Pioneer Register and Index, Volume 4, (first edition) page 730, he says of Dr. John Marsh: "He received the first immigration party, Bartelson's, at his rancho, and afforded them much assistance, though he made the new comers pay

well for his services, and grievously offended many of them by his meanness." And again, he says, in the same volume, pages 730-731: "Dr. Marsh was a peculiar and generally disagreeable man, whose notorious parsimony kept him constantly in trouble with most that came in contact with him."

In the second edition of the same volume, these passages were modified as follows, viz.: "He received the first immigration party, Bartelson's, at his rancho, and offered them much assistance. Dr. Marsh was a man of great intelligence, varied accomplishments, and of singular experience of life."

In his "History of California," (Volume 6, pages 10 and 11, first edition,) he says: Dr. John Marsh, the said doctor being a kind of crank from Harvard College, who settled here in 1837, in an adobe hut, and achieved distinction as a misanthrope and miner, sympathetic with the spirit at whose mountain's feet (Mt. Diablo) he crouched."

The second edition, same volume, same pages, reads as follows: "Dr. John Marsh, the said doctor being a graduate of Harvard College, who settled here in 1837, building a substantial stone house, where he lived in the retirement he so loved. He was a highly individualized and intellectual man, whose letters to Secretary Marcy and other officials contain valuable information about California."

In his California Inter Pocula, first edition, page 342, he says: "Augustin Haraszthy, melter and refiner of the San Francisco branch mint, on the 19th of September, was indicted by the United States grand jury upon the charge of embezzling gold to the amount of $151,550. He was arrested and released on $20,000 bail. Afterwards, he was tried and sentenced to six years in the State prison and to pay a fine of $2000."

In the second edition of the same volume, appears the following in place of the foregoing statement. "During the administration of President Pierce, Augustin Haraszthy was appointed assayer, and later melter and refiner of the San

Francisco branch mint, resigning these positions in 1857. He afterwards built the metallurgical works, which have been of much service to the community, and are still in operation, receiving also patents for improved processes in the refining of gold."

In his "Popular Tribunals," (first edition) Volume 2, page 388, in treating of the stabbing of Hopkins by Judge Terry, during the Vigilance Committee excitement of 1856, the following passage occurs: "That villainous stab of the Supreme Court Justice struck the death-blow of his party. Now let Johnson proclaim until he is hoarse; let Howard rage until he bursts! The city in ashes, forsooth! Its gutters running red with the blood of its citizens! Better down on your knees most learned and puissant assassin, and pray your God, if you have one, that your victim may live; for if Hopkins dies, you hang!"

In the second edition of the same volume, on the same page, this passage is stricken out and the following substituted in its place: "The open and violent collision with the Vigilant forces was the deathblow to the opposing party, and there is no question now that, in the event of Hopkin's death, a Justice of the Supreme Court will be executed by the Vigilance Committee. This presents nothing new in the popular tribunal principle, but if it happens it adds greatly to the cause of the Committee."

Again, on pages 420, 421 and 423, in the first issue, occur the following passages in regard to Terry. "A Texan border man with Texan border principles, he recognized fully pistol persuasion, bowie-knife justice and duello chivalry. He was a man of remarkable ability in certain directions, with a proud, impetuous nature, and an indomitable will, as ready to die for a friend, or make others die for him, as to hunt an enemy to death. * * * It is a character glaring with inconsistencies and contradictions, a character which must needs gratify

all its own unjust, immoral, law-breaking propensities, but denies under the statute any such right to others. * * * His instincts seem to have been atrocious. In Texas he is said to have hunted the natives with remorseless cruelty, killing them as Nero killed flies, for the fun of it. * * * Blood and chivalry! Criminality and cowardice! How many attempts to kill unarmed men make a murderer? But the catalogue of his crimes, black enough to consign him to eternal infamy, is not half told."

In the corrected later issue, these and many other like denunciations of Terry are stricken out and words of palliation and praise are substituted in their place.

Again, at page 483 of the same volume, in the first issue, he said of Terry: "Though this unrighteous and blood-thirsty judge richly deserved hanging, it was beyond the line of duty and policy marked out for themselves by the committee to so punish him. For had they hanged all who really deserved it, their hands would indeed have been full."

In the corrected later issue, the following passage took the place of the foregoing: "If the tribunal erred it was always on the side of leniency, in this matter following the example and the law, as may well be imagined, with a thousand unpunished murderers in the country. Had they hanged all who really deserved it, their hands would indeed have been full."

Again, at page 437 of the same volume, he says, in the first issue of that volume, in alluding to Terry: "And now that the writer of this history has placed the great prime minister of disorderly law back upon his bench, there once more to deal fist, pistol and bowie-knife justice, as in days past, etc."

In the new issue of the same volume, at the same page, this passage is modified to read as follows: "And now that the writer of this history has placed the great prime minister of disorderly law back upon his bench, there once more to deal high and holy justice, as in days past, etc."

But the ease with which Mr. Bancroft can shuffle out of responsibility, as an historian, is best illustrated in another passage from Vol. 2, page 368, where, in the first issue, in alluding to Volney E. Howard and Terry, he said: "What was Howard's patriotism? Self-glorification; pompous display; blood-and-thunder greatness. What was Terry's patriotism? Partisan jealousy; malignant passion; blood-thirsty revenge."

In the new issue, of the same volume, this passage was modified by simply substituting other names for those of Howard and Terry, so that it reads as follows now: "What was McGowan's patriotism? Self-glorification; pompous display; blood-and-thunder greatness. What was Casey's patriotism? Partisan jealousy; malignant passion; blood-thirsty revenge."

As these changes were made during the lifetime of Terry and in an apparent disinclination to face the consequences of his first utterances, the sharp comments of a San Francisco journal, which recently published these extracts, would seem to be fully justified. It said, "Bancroft appreciates the difference in danger of criticising the living, and defaming the dead."

Seventh.—Throughout the innumerable books known as "Bancroft's Histories," there were constant and sweeping assertions that all men who ever wrote upon California, in an historical and other way, who have reached conclusions that are contrary to those which Mr. Bancroft maintains, are "liars," as the briefest way of disposing of their narratives. And this, too, usually without the support of evidence to sustain his arrogant and ill-bred dictum, taking it for granted that such dictum will be held by the general public as an imperial edict, not to be gainsaid or disputed coming from so high an authority as himself, as the historian of historians of the age we live in. One fact stands out with singular promi-

nence throughout these cowardly assertions, and that is, that every one of the men whom he thus denounces as "liars," have long since passed over to the great majority, and can make no answer to these cruel attacks upon their memories. It is the duty of the Society of California Pioneers to vindicate their names and their memories from these wanton slanders, in so far as it may be in their power to do so.

Beginning with Chaplain Fletcher, who accompanied Sir Francis Drake on his famous voyage in 1578-79, and who visited California in July of the latter year, Bancroft says (volume 1, "History of California," pages 85-91): "It should be noted that no regular diary or log of this voyage is extant or is known to have been extant. Of the three narratives which I have cited one was perhaps written from memory by a companion of Drake. The others are compilations from notes of the chaplain, Fletcher, written under circumstances of which we know but little, *by a man not noted for his veracity*, and from the reminiscences probably of others." Again, on page 91, he says: "Few have been sufficiently impressed with the fundamental truth that Chaplain Fletcher was a liar."

In view of the fact that at the present writing a memorial cross and monument are being erected in our own "Golden Gate Park," in commemoration of the first Christian religious services ever held on California soil, and that such services were performed by this same "Chaplain Fletcher—Bancroft's colossal liar—there would seem to be a clear cut issue thus presented for a public verdict, and that is that such commemorative tribute to Christian advancement of more than three centuries ago, and to the humble minister of God, who was the instrument of its performance, is either as grotesque homage to a man utterly unworthy of being thus immortalized, or Bancroft and his books are worthy only of the contempt of his felllow men.

It would be more than wearisome to follow Mr. Bancroft in his endless denunciations of other writers upon California,

whom he stigmatizes in a similar manner when their views and their writings fail to be in unison with his own desires and purposes. Some few examples will suffice.

L. W. Hastings, who came to California in 1843, he says, (See Vol. 3, page 778) "went back in '44 by sea, and across Mexico, to publish a worthless book called an 'Emigrant's Guide," and to attract settlers and prospective revolutionists." He was "not overburdened with conscientious scruples, but never getting caught in anything disreputable."

And this of a man who was a member of the Constitutional Convention of 1849, and against whom there is nothing of public record that would in any degree justify this cruel innuendo.

At page 257 of Volume 5, of his "History of California," alluding to the proclamation of Commodore Stockton, issued on taking command in California as the successor of Commodore Sloat, he says: "The paper was made up of falsehood, of irrelevant issues, and bombastic ranting in about equal parts," and again, at page 258, he says: "The third paragraph, describing Castro's outrageous treatment of Fremont, is false from beginning to end."

At page 280, of the same volume, speaking of language attributed to Commodore Stockton in reply to an embassy, which had been sent to warn him against entering Los Angeles with his forces, "Have the bells ready to toll at eight o'clock, as I shall be there at that time." He says, that this and other preceding statements "may very safely be designated as falsehoods, pure and simple." In a foot note on the same page, alluding to the last quoted statement of Stockton, he says, "This last lie was taken by this writer, as it has been by others, from Colton's three years in California, '56," thus adding the name of Colton to his list of "liars."

So in a foot note at page 316 of the same volume, he quotes from the account of the retreat from Santa Barbara of Talbot and his little command, who had been left in charge

there, as given by Captain Phelps in his narrative of events of that time, entitled "Fore and Aft," as follows: "Finding they (the Californians) would not fight, Talbot marched off in a hollow square, followed by the 'caballeros,' who reviled the brave squad, but dare not attack them." "All this," says Bancroft, "is purely imaginary." And, while he admits that Phelps' statement was confirmed by Talbot's men on their arrival at Monterey, yet he does not hesitate to pillory them all in his catalogue of falsifiers, by saying, that evidently Talbot's men "indulged in the trapper's propensity for story telling."

At page 16 of volume 6, he groups as falsifiers a quartette of American writers—Revere, Phelps, Tuthill and Lancey—who, in their historical writings have dared to denounce Castro, for endeavoring to drive Fremont out of the country in March, 1846, and sets up his own unsupported dictum to the contrary, as sufficient answer to them all.

At page 61 of Volume 6, of his "History of California," after giving an account of the junta held at the house of Thos. O. Larkin, at Monterey in March, 1846, as related by General M. G. Vallejo, in which Vallejo spoke in favor of annexation to the United States, according to his own written statement of the facts—Bancroft cooly gives him the lie in this wise: "No such meeting was ever held, and no such speeches were ever made," and he adds, "but in thus recording a formal meeting, with deliberate discussions of propositions to deliver their country to a foreign power, I am very sure that General Vallejo's memory has been greatly aided by his imagination."

Again, at page 151 of same volume, in treating of the Ide's proclamation at the time of the Bear Flag episode, he says: "This proclamation consisted, first, of a statement of the inducements under which the revolutionists had settled in California—false from beginning to end; second, charges of deception and oppression by the authorities—equally false," etc. * * * "As a whole, in truthfulness and consistency,

as in orthography and literary merit, it was below the plane of Castro's and Pico's proclamations."

Lancey, author of a manuscript record preserved, as Bancroft says in his library, entitled "Lancey's cruise of the Dale," is let down without being stigmatized as a falsifier, but still, according to Mr. Bancroft, (see page 704, Vol. 4, of his "History of California,") "in my opinion, excessively American in his views," the same idea being prevalent throughout Mr. Bancroft's works, that to write from an American standpoint is an unpardonable offence.

Even the name of Thomas O. Larkin—from whose documents, obtained from his family and now in Mr. Bancroft's library, he has drawn so largely for material for his historical writing—does not escape from being written down as a falsifier, by innuendo sufficiently direct to lead to no other conclusion on the part of any intelligent reader.

Alluding to a letter from Mr. Buchanan, then Secretary of State, to Mr. Larkin, at page 597 of Volume 4, of his "History of California," and quoting from such letter as follows: "Whilst I repeat that this government does not, under existing circumstances, intend to interfere between Mexico and California," Bancroft says, "there was, as my reader knows no present controversy between the two, *though it had suited Larkin's purposes to represent the contrary.*"

At page 706, of the same volume, he has another fling at this well remembered and much respected deceased member of this Society, where he says he had "the proverbial Yankee shrewdness in trade, with no inconvenient veneration for the revenue laws."

These are but a few of the examples of reckless, random writing, which characterize the remarkable works known as "Bancroft's Histories."

They need not be referred to in *extenso*—further, as they are sufficient testimony in themselves to convince every intelligent and fair-minded man, that he who can thus wantonly reflect

upon the names and memories of the dead, against whom no word of detraction has ever before been uttered, convicts himself as a falsifier, and is therefore unworthy of belief as an historical writer, and, among California Pioneers, is unworthy of association in the quality of an "Honorary Membership."

(Signed) W. B. FARWELL,
(For the Society of California Pioneers.)

Your Committee caused a copy of these charges to be prepared for service upon Mr. Bancroft, together with a written notification from them, of which the following is a copy, viz.:

HALL OF THE SOCIETY OF CALIFORNIA PIONEERS,
San Francisco, December 5, 1893.

HUBERT H. BANCROFT, ESQ.,

Dear Sir: The undersigned, a committee of the Society of California Pioneers, appointed to investigate and report upon certain charges of misconduct against you as an Honorary Member of this Society, hereby notify you that Tuesday evening, December 12, 1893, at 7:30 P. M., at the Committee room of Pioneer Hall, has been fixed as the time and place for the hearing of said charges; and that the type-written document of pages one to twenty-four, both inclusive of this date, signed by Willard B. Farwell, Esq., as the prosecutor on behalf of the Society, is a true copy of the charges against you for investigation; and that you are respectfully invited to attend at said time and place (with counsel if you please) for the purpose of said investigation.

(Signed) WM. SIMPSON,
R. THOMPSON,
A. S. HALL,
S. W. HOLLADAY.

This notification, together with a copy of the charges, was, at the request of the Committee, placed in the hands of the

Marshal of the Society, by the Secretary, for service upon Mr. Bancroft, who made the following return upon the same.

San Francisco, December 6th, 1893.

I hereby certify that this is a true copy of a paper which was enclosed in a sealed envelope, directed to Mr. Hubert H. Bancroft.

John F. Pinkham,
Marshal Society of California Pioneers.

In accordance with this notification, your Committee met on the 12th day of December, 1893, for the purpose therein stated. Mr. Bancroft not appearing before them, either in person or by representative, your committee requested Mr. Holladay to ascertain Bancroft's post office address and to forward to him by registered letter another copy of the charges, together with a further notification, fixing the 26th day of December upon which the Committee would again meet, and give him another opportunity to be heard, if he desired to do so. Your Committee met again, on the date and at the hour mentioned in said last named notification, but Mr. Bancroft not appearing, and no response having been received from him, adjourned until the 9th day of January, 1894. Mr. Bancroft not then appearing and no response having been received from him, your Committee adjourned until the 16th of January, 1894, at which time Mr. Bancroft still having failed to appear, and making no response, your Committee deemed it unnecessary to delay the investigation further and, therefore, proceeded to hear and consider the charges, which had been formulated by Mr. Farwell and so served upon Mr. Bancroft.

This indictment—if we may so term it—is divided into *seven counts*, each one of which is made up of a group of specific charges, each of which charges your Committee proceeded to carefully and patiently investigate by reference to, and comparison with, the several volumes of "Bancroft's Histories," at the several pages therein specifically referred to. As the

result of such investigation and comparison, your Committee find as follows:

First—The charges, set forth in the *first count* of said "indictment," touching Mr. Bancroft's treatment of the names of Fremont, Stockton, Sutter and the men of the "Bear Flag Party," and which are covered by the preamble and resolutions introduced by Mr. Farwell and adopted by the Society, as hereinbefore set forth, your Committee find, are fully sustained.

Second—The charges, grouped in the *second count* of the indictment, and which consist of instances of unjust and cruel attacks upon the names and memories of early Pioneers, who were among the originators and early members of this Society, and none of whom are now living, your Committee also find, fully sustained.

Third—The charges, of misrepresentation of the facts of history and of maligning the memories of those Americans and others who were unjustly arrested and expatriated to Mexico in 1840, under circumstances of extreme cruelty and injustice, and of abuse and vilification of T. J. Farnham who was an eye witness of the affair, and who wrote an account of the same in his book, (published in 1852) entitled "Life, Adventures and Travels in California," your Committee find are fully sustained, and comprise in themselves an act unworthy of any fair-minded historian, and abhorrent to every unprejudiced and patriotic American citizen.

Fourth—The extraordinary charge, of having in his first edition of Volume 2, of the "History of Oregon," published an account of a trial of certain Cayuse Indian murderers, held many years ago before a judge who was then, and up to the time of his death remained a member in good standing of this Society, in which the said judge was made the subject of attack in terms, which, if they had been true, would have consigned his name and memory to lasting infamy; and of striking all this out and publishing in the second edition of the same

volume, an exactly opposite statement of eulogy and praise, as shown in the *fourth count* of said indictment, your Committee not only find fully sustained, but regard it as a shameful act, sufficient in itself to render the works of any so-called "historian" unworthy of credence.

Fifth—The apparently malignant, and certainly cruel and unjust, attack upon the name and memory of General Grant, who, while living, was an honored, as well as an "Honorary Member" of this Society, as set forth in the *fifth count* of this indictment, your Committee find fully sustained, and cannot refrain from expressing the opinion, that to retain the name of General Grant in its list of "Honorary Members," together with that of his maligner, Hubert Howe Bancroft, would be an act of inconsistency unworthy of the name and fame of the "Society of California Pioneers."

Sixth—The group of charges comprised in the *sixth count* of this indictment, wherein contradictory statements, in regard to early Pioneers, appear in the different editions of the same volumes, and the pusillanimous treatment of the late Judge Terry's conflict with the "Vigilance Committee" of 1856, as related and exposed, we find fully sustained.

Seventh—The closing, or *seventh count* of this already more than severe indictment, wherein it is shown that Mr. Bancroft's methods of writing history are, to assert certain conclusions of his own, in regard to the men and events of the period of which he has written and to denounce all who differ with him as "liars," no matter what part they may have played in these events, how much better may have been their opportunities of knowing the true facts of history, how upright may have been their lives, or how unsullied their reputations while living, we find fully sustained.

Finally, the case, as presented against Mr. Bancroft, as a whole, constitutes, in the opinion of your Special Committee, valid reasons why the name of Hubert Howe Bancroft should

no longer be permitted to remain upon the roll of this Society as an "Honorary Member." The indifference, not to say the contempt, with which he has treated the Society, in not appearing before your Committee or making any reply to its communications, renders it unnecessary for us to give the matter any further consideration, than to report back the resolution and recommend its adoption.

We may be permitted to add, that, in vindication of the truth of early California history, and of the real facts relating to the conquest and acquisition of the country by the United States, as well as in vindication of the memories of the many early Pioneers who have been maligned and misrepresented in these so-called "Bancroft's Histories," your Committee recommend that the "Board of Directors" be requested to have all the proceedings heretofore had, as well as those which may be had, upon the subject matter here under consideration, compiled and printed in proper form for general distribution among the *Public Libraries* of the United States and elsewhere, as may be deemed desirable and proper.

(Signed) WILLIAM SIMPSON,
R. THOMPSON,
S. W. HOLLADAY,
A. S. HALL.
} Committee.

The following resolution was offered by Dr. Wm. Simpson in regard to the Bear Flag Revolt:

Resolved, That since Bancroft in his "History of California," while dealing with the Bear Flag Revolt, has misrepresented the purposes and aims of that uprising, mistaken the conditions which brought it about, and has made it the opportunity of many severe attacks upon pioneer characters, we therefore offer the following brief review of that episode, in the interest of truth, and in justice to the memories of the men engaged in it.

It will be found that at the time of this event, there were about 1000 Americans (in a population, including Indians, of 16,000) residing in California, every one of whom had enjoyed the blessings and advantages of our system of government, and who hoped and expected at some future time to see our flag waving over the territory upon which their new homes were built. This wish was intensified by the unhappy condition of things surrrounding them, and which were gradually growing worse, as their numbers increased, by the aroused jealousy and suspicion of the Mexican and California officials. It was not only the weakness and instability of the government to which they were obliged to submit, or the insecurity of property, and discouragements to industry which the Mexican system imposed, that caused the few Americans living here at that time to wish ardently for a change. A greater and far more serious interruption in the ordinary pursuits of life was impending, and growing more threatening from day to day. Texas had recently been annexed against the remonstrance of Mexico. The mission of Mr. Slidel to that country had been without a peaceful result, and had only produced new animosity. A large American force had been ordered near the Mexican border, and by these signs, as well as others, the coming war was easily predicted. It required no more than ordinary intelligence to foresee, in the expected hostilities, the loss of California to Mexico, and its probable conquest by either the United States or England. A peaceful cession to the latter country had been discussed by the California authorities, and was growing more popular among the native Californians as the rumors of war increased, and as their animosities against the Americans became excited by the critical condition of their mother country. While it remains to this day a matter of conjecture how far England was willing to proceed in securing to herself this territory, its peaceful surrender to her by the California authorities was not likely to be refused, and the whole American colony was in suspense and excitement in dread of such an occurrence. Their fortunes were not only

dangerously involved in the outcome, but, during the period of expected hostilities between the United States and Mexico, they could easily anticipate the great danger and distress awaiting them. American residents within the seaports and vicinities were assured of protection by their country's warships, of which a number were already on the coast, but those of the interior had no other treatment to expect, in the event of war, than the well known Mexican methods of retaliation and punishment, and among these one quite likely to be invoked, and actually attempted later on, was the setting upon them of the Indians, who had not yet lost their sense of obedience to the California officials, so lately holding them in authority by the influence of the Missions. The necessity of an organization among the Americans living in the interior was apparent, and while [considering] it an event occurred, which greatly aggravated the situation, and led to an immediate coming together of a number of settlers, not for defense only, but with the further purpose of assisting to secure the territory to the United States. The event spoken of was the accidental arrival within the borders of California, of Fremont with his band of explorers. Fremont's difficulty with Castro, the details of which are too well known to require mention here, aroused that Mexican military commander to immediately issue proclamations of a warlike character, and to begin the organization of a military force.

There were a number of threatening rumors afloat besides, which, even admitting the extravagance of some of them, we know to have been generally believed. Bancroft himself furnishes evidence of this in the publication of the testimony, in a foot note, of no less than seventeen persons living at the time. These witnesses, among whom are a committee of citizens, in a report published in 1847—W. B. Ide, H. L. Ford, Wm. Hargrave, Benj. Dowell, Marshal, Semple, Hensley, Owens, Loker, Sutter and Fremont—all of whom agreed and believed that the Mexican government had determined upon

the expulsion of the Americans from the country, and that Castro was inciting the Indians against them, and threatening to burn their crops, and that they would have to leave the country or fight for their homes. Although this strong array of evidence was set forth by Bancroft for the purpose of disproval, and, as we believe, to lay the foundation of a bitter attack upon a famous Pioneer, its impeachment, under his examination, can have no effect whatever to impugn the motives of the settlers in organizing the "Bear Flag Revolt," since it cannot be denied they believed the rumors and were sincerely acting under the impressions they created.

The Bear insurrection was essentially a movement of defense, The grand possibilities of the country under a better administration, which time has so fully verified, were apparent to its movers, and furnished an additional motive to assist, either by direct or remote methods, to bring the territory under the dominion of the United States. The threatened misfortune of being placed under English, instead of Americen rule, had its effect also to promote and excuse that severity and promptness of action, so necessary to success in such an undertaking.

In the condemnation of the "Bear Flag Revolt," Bancroft lays great stress on what he terms its embarassment to a peaceful conquest of the country. Some later events ought to have proved to his mind that a ready submission, by the mere raising of American flags in the seaports, was not likely to have taken place. Whoever has reckoned on such a result, has made too low an estimate of the patriotism and bravery of the people with whom we had to deal. It is reasonable to conclude that their early submission was as much due to Fremont's ever-ready opposing force at hand, interrupting the progress of their concentration and unity of action, as it was to any measured hopelessness of their situation. We have a taste of what may have occurred, in the bloody engagements of San Pasquale, Natividad and elsewhere. An invitation of departure to the Americans must have come in due time under

the usages of war, and by an early successful skirmish or two, unopposed by a thoroughly organized American force, arousing thus the hopes of the natives, and stimulating their patriotism to the bitter extremity perhaps of enlisting the Indians in their behalf; the comparatively small amount of bloodshed, of which Bancroft makes such virtuous complaint, would have been but as a drop in the bucket compared with that likely to have been spilt.

The intermediary stage of independence proposed by the "Bear Revolt" was a forced extremity, owing to the position, and suggested by the then recent example of Texas. At the time of its organization, there was no way at hand to place it under the authority of the United States, and no military officer within a thousand miles to muster it into service. Its proclamation of independence cuts but a small figure in its history, because of the willing abandonment of its flag, and the substitution of the "Stars and Stripes" within less than a month of its independent organization. Its ready mergence into the California Battalion, under the flag of the United States, and the heartfelt and genuine enthusiasm expressed by its members on the raising of the American flags at San Francisco, Monterey, Los Angeles and elsewhere, leaves no doubt of their loyalty and patriotism. Their individual careers, down to the present time, exhibit more than an average of usefulness and prominence in society.

We are therefore of the opinion that Bancroft has neither fairly nor truthfully set forth the motives and character of the "Bear Flag Revolt," in his "History of California," and his allusion to it as the "criminal outbreak of vagabond settlers" is flagrantly and maliciously untrue.

(Signed) WILLIAM SIMPSON.

PIONEER HALL, San Francisco.

At the regular monthly meeting of the members of "The Society of California Pioneers," held at Pioneer Hall on Monday, February 5th, 1894,—there being eighty members present per register—the Special Committee appointed to investigate the charges made by Dr. Washington Ayer against Hubert Howe Bancroft, submitted their final report, which was read by the Secretary; and also the resolution offered by Dr. Wm. Simpson, in relation to the "Bear Flag Party."

The following action was then taken by the Society:

Dr. Wm. Simpson moved the adoption of the report of the Committee. On being duly seconded the question was called, and on being put to a vote the Chair declared it *carried unanimously*, and the report of the Committee adopted.

W. B. Farwell moved that the resolution offered by Dr. Washington Ayer, proposing that the name of Hubert Howe Bancroft be stricken from the roll of Honorary Membership in this Society, be formally adopted. On being duly seconded, the question was called, and on being put to a vote the Chair declared it *carried unanimously*, and that Hubert Howe Bancroft was no longer an Honorary Member of this "The Society of California Pioneers."

Dr. Wm. Simpson, after the reading of his resolution, in relation to the "Bear Flag Party," moved its adoption. On being duly seconded the Chair declared it *carried unanimously*.

(Signed) C. V. S. GIBBS,
President.

[SEAL.] JOHN I. SPEAR,
Secretary.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 753 632 A